# Exhibit 3

July 14, 2022

#### Moon Duchin, PhD The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

	The South Caronna State Convs. McMaster/Alexander						
		Page 1					
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA						
2	COLUMBIA DIVISION						
3	THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE NAACP						
4	and						
5	TAIWAN SCOTT, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF						
6	AND ALL OTHER SIMILARLY SITUATED PERSONS,						
7	Plaintiffs,						
8	vs. Case No. 3:21-CV-03302-JMC-TJH-RMG						
9	THOMAS C. ALEXANDER, IN HIS OFFICIAL						
10	CAPACITY AS PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE; LUKE A. RANKIN, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY						
11	AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE; MURRELL SMITH, IN HIS OFFICIAL						
12	CAPACITY AS SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; CHRIS MURPHY, IN HIS						
13	OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES JUDICIARY COMMITTEE;						
14	WALLACE H. JORDAN, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
15	ELECTIONS LAW SUBCOMMITTEE; HOWARD KNAPP, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS INTERIM						
16	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE ELECTION COMMISSION; JOHN WELLS,						
17	JOANNE DAY, CLIFFORD J. EDLER, LINDA MCCALL, AND SCOTT MOSELEY, IN THEIR OFFICIAL						
18	CAPACITIES AS MEMBERS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE ELECTION COMMISSION,						
19	Defendants.						
20							
21							
22	DEPOSITION OF: MOON DUCHIN, PHD (Via Videoconference)						
23	DATE: Tuesday, July 14, 2022						
24	TIME: 10:13 a.m.						
25							

#### Moon Duchin, PhD

#### July 14, 2022

#### The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	LOCATION: Barnum Hall Packard Avenue Medford, Massachusetts TAKEN BY: Counsel for Thomas Alexander and Luke Rankin  REPORTED BY: Elaine L. Grove-DeFreitas, Independent Professional Reporter (Via Videoconference)	Page 2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:  ATTORNEYS FOR THE HOUSE DEFENDANTS:  NEXSEN PRUET, LLC BY: ANDREW MATHIAS 104 South Main Street Suite 900 Greenville, South Carolina 29601 864-370-2211 AMathias@nexsenpruet.com (Via Videoconference)  ATTORNEYS FOR ELECTION DEFENDANTS: BURR & FORMAN, LLP BY: JANE W. TRINKLEY 1221 Main Street Suite 1800 Columbia, South Carolina 29201 803-799-9800 jtrinkley@burr.com (Via Videoconference)  ALSO PRESENT: Cyndi Nygord (via videoconference)	Page 4
23 24 25	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:		23 24 25 1	INDEX Page Line	Page 5
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ATTORNEYS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE NAACP AND MOON DUCHIN, PHD:  NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE & EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC. BY: LEAH ADEN BY: JOHN CUSICK 40 Rector Street Fifth Floor New York, New York 10006 917-858-2870 laden@naacpldf.org jcusick@naacpldf.org jcusick@naacpldf.org (Via Videoconference)  ATTORNEYS FOR THOMAS C. ALEXANDER AND LUKE A. RANKIN: JONES DAY BY: JOHN M. GORE 51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 202-879-3930 jmgorc@jonesday.com (Via Videoconference)			EXAMINATION BY MR. GORE	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	(Via Videoconference)  ATTORNEYS FOR THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION:  AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION BY: ADRIEL I. CEPEDA DERIEUX 125 Broad Street 18th Floor New York, New York 10004 212-549-2500 ACepedaDerieux@aclu.org (Via Videoconference)		18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	EXHIBIT 5, No Exhibit Introduced  EXHIBIT 6, Curriculum Vitae of Moon Duchin, PhD 195  EXHIBIT 7, Expert Report of Sean P. Trende 196/16  EXHIBIT 8, May 4, 2022 Response to the Expert  Report of Sean P. Trende dated April 18, 2022 197/17	/24

2 (Pages 2 - 5)

### Moon Duchin, PhD

July 14, 2022

#### The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

	The South Caronna State C	OIII	vs.iviciviastei/Alexandei	
	Page 6		Page 8	
1	MOON DUCHIN, PHD,	1	answer the question before we go to the break. Is	
2	being first duly sworn, testified as follows:	2	that fair?	
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION	3	A. Yes.	
4	BY MR. GORE:	4	Q. Okay. Thank you. So Dr. Duchin, where	
5	Q. Good morning, Dr. Duchin. My name is	5	are you today?	
6	John Gore. I'm with the Law Firm of Jones Day. I	6	A. I'm at Tufts University in	
7	represent the Senate Defendants, Thomas Alexander		Massachusetts.	
8	and Luke Rankin in connection with the redistricting	8	Q. And is anyone in the room with you?	
9	challenge that has been brought in the United States	9	A. No.	
10	District Court for the District of South Carolina.	10	Q. And do you have any papers with you	
11	And you understand that you're appearing in	11	where you are?	
12	connection with that case today. Correct?	12	A. I do not.	
13	A. Yes.	13	Q. What did you do to prepare for today's	
14	Q. And will you say and spell your first	14	deposition?	
15	and last names for the record, please?	15	A. I did two preparation sessions with	
16	A. Sure. It's Moon Duchin. That's	16	6 counsel in which we reviewed the materials and	
17	M-O-O-N, D-U-C-H-I-N.	17	discussed some likely questions.	
18	Q. And you understand that you're under	18	Q. And when did the first of those two	
19	oath and have an obligation to tell the truth today.	19	sessions take place?	
20	Correct?	20	A. Late last week. I believe it was	
21	A. I do.	21	Friday.	
22	Q. We have a court reporter here to take	22	Q. And how long did it last?	
23	down your testimony. The court reporter does need	23	A. One to two hours.	
24	verbal answers, so please give a verbal answer to	24	Q. Who was present?	
25	each question, a yes or a no. The court reporter	25	A. Leah Aden and John Cusick, both of whom	
	Page 7		Page 9	
1	cannot record a nod or a headshake. Does that sound	1	are on the call today, and myself.	
2	fair?	2	Q. And when did the second preparation	
3	A. Yes.	3	session take place?	
4	Q. And you're being defended in this	4	A. Tuesday, the day before yesterday.	
5	deposition today by Ms. Aden, I believe. Is that	5	Q. And how long did that last?	
6	right?	6	A. I would estimate that was about an hour.	
7	A. Yes.	7	Q. Who was present?	
8	Q. And Ms. Aden may object to a question	8	A. The same people.	
9	that I pose, such as an objection to form or	9	Q. And did you review any documents in	
10	something like that. Unless you're instructed not	10	preparation for today's deposition?	
11	to answer, you can go ahead and answer my question.	11	A. Yes.	
12	Does that make sense?	12	Q. And which documents did you review?	
13	A. Yes.	13	A. We reviewed my two reports that I	
14	Q. And the most important rule here today	14	believe are dated April 11th and May 4th. We may	
15	is if you don't understand a question, will you ask	15	have briefly reviewed the House and the Senate	
16	me to clarify the question?	16	Guidelines on redistricting. That is all that I	
17	A. Yes.	17	recall.	
18	Q. And if you do answer a question, I will	18	Q. Do you know why you were retained to	
19	assume that you understood it. Is that fair?	19	provide a report in this case?	
20	A. Yes.	20	A. Yes. I discussed the assignment with in	
21	Q. Also, this is not a marathon. It may	21	my first report, but so can we pull that up?	
22	feel a little bit like a slog at times, but if you	22	Q. We can. Just one second. Let me ask	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22		
23	need to take a break for any reason, at any time	23	you a question, first, if that's okay.	
	need to take a break for any reason, at any time just let me know and we can do that. The only thing	23	A. Sure.	
23				

## Moon Duchin, PhD

July 14, 2022

#### The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

	The South Carolina State C		v Silvier v Lagren, r Herrander	
	Page 102		Page 104	
1	language minority group. That's just an example.	1	Q. May I try to rephrase it, then?	
2	But	2	A. Please.	
3	Q. Right. I'm sorry. Finish your answer.	3	Q. Would that be okay?	
4	A. Just that there are very few	4	Are you aware of any prohibition on a	
5	restrictions of that kind in the law that I'm aware	5	map drawer or General Assembly considering a legal	
6	of.	6	criterion that it has kept private and not disclosed	
7	Q. But even in that example it's not the	7	publicly?	
8	fact that that criterion is private.	8	A. Just to repeat, I think they are	
9	A. That's correct.	9	allowed, legally, to consider anything that is	
10	Q. It's that it's illegal.	10	legally permissible.	
11	A. That's correct. It's not the fact of	11	Q. Okay. Thank you. And then my next	
12	having been private, but in some possibilities the	12	question on this is, are you aware of any	
13	nature of the private motivation.	13	prohibition on a map drawer or General Assembly	
14	Q. And so focusing just on the fact that	14	prioritizing a legal criterion that it has kept	
15	something is private, does the fact that a criterion	15		
16	is private mean a map drawer or General Assembly is	16		
17	prohibited from considering it?	17	Q. It's a yes or no, if that's possible.	
18	A. I think just to answer the question	18	A. You're asking if I know of a law.	
19	technically first, I think they can consider	19	Right?	
20	anything at all. However, I do think that when	20	Q. Yes.	
21	those considerations start to come at a cost to the	21	A. I do not know of such a law.	
22	ones that are named in law, that that's where you	22	MR. GORE: Can we maybe take a minute to	
23	could run into trouble. But I truly in an honest	23	go off the record for a second?	
24	effort to address your question as you asked it,	24	THE WITNESS: Fine with me.	
25	anything can be considered. But if those	25	(Discussion Off The Record)	
			D 105	
1	Page 103 considerations come at a cost to the traditional	1	Page 105 (Break In Proceedings)	
2	principles, that might start to invite scrutiny.	2	MR. GORE: Back on the record.	
3	Q. Well, it might invite scrutiny, but is	3	BY MR. GORE:	
4	it illegal?	4	Q. Dr. Duchin, did you discuss this case	
5	MS. ADEN: Objection.	5	with anyone during your break?	
6	THE WITNESS: I would say that, in my	6	A. No, I didn't talk to anyone during the	
7	understanding, that just really depends on the	7	break.	
8	nature of what is being prioritized. At a cost to	8	Q. All right. Let's go back to your report	
9	what?	9	that I have pulled up here. Can you see this on	
10	BY MR. GORE:	10	your screen?	
11	Q. But that analysis, in your experience,	11	A. Yes.	
12	doesn't turn on whether the criterion is private or	12	Q. Let's go to page 17, Figure 5.	
13	public?	13	A. Yes.	
14	A. Okay. Let me let me disambiguate two	14	Q. Can you just tell me what these red and	
15	things. So one is whether something might be	15	black lines are?	
16	legally suspect, and another is whether it might be	16	A. Yes. The red lines are the municipal	
17	against the law. So I think there is a special role	17	boundaries of Charleston and North Charleston, and	
18	in the law around redistricting related to I	18	the black ones are district boundaries.	
	think race, generally, is treated with a whole host	19		
19 20	of special provisions in the law. In particular,	20	Q. So these are not county boundaries,	
20 21	the role of intent versus results is special for		then. Is that right?	
21 22	race in current law.	21 22	A. That's right. They are municipal and district boundaries.	
22 23		23		
23	And so to your question about whether private considerations are prohibited, I find that		Q. And I think you say here, in heading D,	
25	question too general to answer.	24 25	"Charleston County split erratically."  A. That's right.	
	question too general to answel.	<sub>1</sub> 43	A. Hat S Hgitt.	